



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/650,325	08/27/2003	Jaime Bayan	NSC1P274/P05649	6886
22434	7590	06/10/2005	EXAMINER	
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP			IM, JUNGHWA M	
P.O. BOX 70250			ART UNIT	
OAKLAND, CA 94612-0250			PAPER NUMBER	
			2811	

DATE MAILED: 06/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b> <b>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/650,325	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BAYAN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Junghwa M. Im	<b>Art Unit</b> 2811	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 09 May 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
 5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
 6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
 7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
 The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
 Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
 Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
 Claim(s) rejected: 1, 3-16, 18-22 and 31-35.  
 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
 9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_  
 13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Steven Loke  
 Primary Examiner

*Steven Loke*

Continuation of 3. NOTE: the proposed amendments to the claims 9, 10, 15 and 22 would require further search and/or consideration.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding the argument over the rejections under 35 USC 112, Applicant mainly argues that "In general, one aspect of the invention applies to a substrate panel (e.g., Claims 1-14 and others) which can have exposed contacts on its top surface (See, for example, in Fig. 5A). ... Claims 1 and 11 relate to the substrate panel, and as acknowledged by the Examiner, the wire bonding landings are exposed on the top surface of the substrate panel. There is no requirement that such a structure be encapsulated, such is only one possible implementation." It is pointed out that the instant invention discloses in paragraph [0020] that the substrate in Fig. 5A is shown "before encapsulation."

Regarding the additional argument over the lead segment, Fig. 3C of the instant invention clearly shows that the wire bonding landing is merely a portion of the lead segment where the wire is bonded.

Regarding the argument over the rejections under 35 USC 102, Applicant mainly argues that "in Claims 1, 11, & 15, the 'top surface of the dielectric material is substantially coplanar with the top surface of the substrate panel and the wire bonding landings'. In the Huang reference this is clearly not the case with the second dielectric layer including some very substantial walls 124 that extend upward from the lead frame panel." It is pointed out that claims 1 and 11 recites "a dielectric material that fills spaces between adjacent lead segments ... wherein a top surface of the dielectric material is substantially coplanar with the top surface of the substrate panel and the wire bonding landings." (Claim 15 recites a similar limitation.) Huang explicitly shows the dielectric material which FILLS THE SPACES between adjacent lead segments is coplanar with the substrate panel.

Additionally, Fig. 5 of Huang shows lead segments (106) that are electrically coupled to selected wire bonding landings (the portion where the wire is bonded) to associated contacts (through connecting to the external connection; col. 4, lines 30-33). It is also pointed out that the lead segment portion and wire bonding landing of the instant invention in Fig. 5 of Huang are substantially identical to the ones in Fig. 5 of the instant invention.